

REMARKS

In the Office Action of August 15, 2007, (hereinafter "Office Action"), Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,661,502, to Cheng (hereinafter "Cheng"). Claims 3, 9, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cheng and Japanese Patent Application No. 05-073257 to Matsushita Electric Ind. Co., Ltd (hereinafter "Kensuke"). Claim 11 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

With this response, Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 20 remain pending in the application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. Prior to discussing why applicants believe that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, a brief summary of the pending subject matter is set forth below. This description is provided to assist the Examiner in appreciating the differences between the pending claims and the cited references and not intended to be construed as limiting upon the disclosed subject matter.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Weiner for his time in participating in an Examiner Interview on October 9, 2007 (by telephone). Topics that were addressed in the interview included the particular teachings of Cheng, the nature of the disclosed subject matter, and how the proposed claims are distinguishable from Cheng.

No agreement was reached as to allowability as the Examiner indicates that he would want to conduct a new search in light of the proposed amendments. However, applicants are hopeful that an understanding of the differences between Cheng and the proposed claims was established, and believe that prosecution of the matter was advanced.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS[®]LLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Brief Description of the Pending Subject Matter

The pending subject matter is directed to enhancing the visual appearance of a mouse cursor path when mouse travel exceeds a predetermined threshold. In particular, rather than having large gaps between a previous and current mouse location, which in many cases results in a user losing track of the mouse in relation to the screen, additional mouse cursor images are added to the current mouse path. These additional mouse cursor images may be added in a variety of configurations, each configuration providing a unique presentation system that would be beneficial to a user.

Adding additional images to a mouse cursor path is substantially distinct from smoothing the path of mouse travel and displaying the periodic cursor locations on the smoothed path.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Claim 1

As amended, Claim 1 recites:

A method for enhancing a mouse cursor displayed on a computer display, the method comprising:

obtaining the current mouse cursor speed;

determining whether the current mouse cursor speed exceeds a predetermined threshold, and if so:

generating a mouse path between the current and the previous mouse cursor locations;

determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path between the current and the previous mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path; and

displaying a mouse cursor image at each additional determined cursor location on the generated mouse path in addition to displaying a mouse cursor image at the current mouse cursor location. (Emphasis added.)

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Applicants submit that Cheng fails to disclose at least the element "determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path between the current and the previous mouse cursor locations."

Applicants note that Cheng is directed to generating a smoother cursor path and that cursor locations are translated onto the smoothed cursor path. However, while Cheng translates actual cursor locations onto the smoothed cursor path, Cheng fails to disclose determining additional cursor locations that fall between the current and previous cursor locations and then displaying mouse cursor images on each of the additional cursor locations.

As illustrated in the specification and recited in Claim 1, the claimed subject matter "fills in" the gaps between the current and previous locations so that the cursor path is more easily tracked. Compare, Figure 1 to Figures 10 and 11. In contrast, applicants note that Cheng leaves gaps, and particular notes that, even with the smoothed cursor path, "the distance between points on the lines 300, 302 is proportional to the speed of the mouse movement." Cheng, Col. 5, lines 7-9. In other words, while Cheng is directed to smoothing the cursor path when the mouse speed is high, Cheng does not address the gaps between current and previous locations that result from a high rate of travel.

In view of the amendments and remarks above, applicants submit that Cheng fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 1. Accordingly, applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2, 3, and 7

Claims 2, 3, and 7 each depend from independent Claim 1. Accordingly, for the same reasons as set forth above and when read in combination with Claim 1, applicants submit that

Claims 2, 3, and 7 are in condition for allowance and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 8 and 14

Independent Claims 8 and 14 recite similar elements to those found in Claim 1. In particular, Claim 8 recites:

determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path **between the current and the previous mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path**; and

displaying a mouse cursor image at each additional determined cursor location on the generated mouse path in addition to displaying a mouse cursor image at the current mouse cursor location. (Emphasis added.)

Similarly, Claim 14 recites:

determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path **between the previous location and the current mouse cursor location on the generated mouse path**; and

displaying a mouse cursor image at each additional determined cursor location on the generated mouse path in addition to displaying a mouse cursor image at the current mouse cursor location.

In view of the comment elements, applicants submit that independent Claims 8 and 14 are in condition for allowance and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 3, 9, and 16 were rejected as being obvious in view of Cheng and Kensuke. However, applicants assert that Cheng fails to disclose each element of the independent claims from which Claims 3, 9, and 16 depend. Moreover, Kensuke fails to disclose or teach "determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path between the current and the previous mouse cursor locations," and "displaying a mouse cursor image at each

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

additional determined cursor location on the generated mouse path," as recited in the independent claims. In short, Cheng and Kensuke, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or otherwise make obvious each element recited in Claims 3, 9, and 16 when read in combination with their independent claims. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 3, 9, and 16 are in condition for allowance in view of Cheng and Kensuke, and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 11 was rejected as being obvious in view of Cheng in view of "Animation: From Cartoons to the User Interface" by Bay-Wei Chang ("Animation"). However, applicants assert that Cheng fails to disclose each element of independent Claim 9 from which Claim 11 depends. Moreover, Animation fails to disclose or teach "determining at least one additional cursor location on the generated mouse path between the current and the previous mouse cursor locations," and "displaying a mouse cursor image at each additional determined cursor location on the generated mouse path," as recited in the independent claims. In short, Cheng and Animation, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or otherwise make obvious each element recited in Claim 11, when read in combination with independent Claim 9. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claim 11 is in condition for allowance in view of Cheng and Animation, and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

CONCLUSION


In view of the amendments and remarks above, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, and allowance of the claims at an early date are solicited. If the

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Examiner has any questions or comments concerning the foregoing response, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tracy S. Powell", is written over the printed name and firm name.

Tracy S. Powell
Registration No. 53,479
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1786

TSP:lal

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100